NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
LEROY PEOPLES,		
	Plaintiff,	2 22 27 42 42
v.		9:22-CV-1263 (GTS/TWD)
JOHN SHEA,		
	Defendant.	
APPEARANCES:		OF COUNSEL:

LEROY PEOPLES, 05-A-2620 Plaintiff, *Pro Se* Clinton Correctional Facility P.O. Box 2001 Dannemora, New York 12929

INITED OTATES DISTRICT COLDT

HON. LETITIA A. JAMES
Attorney General for the State of New York
Counsel for Defendants
The Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

AIMEE COWAN, ESQ. Assistant Attorney General

GLENN T. SUDDABY, United States District Judge

DECISION and ORDER

Currently before the Court, in this *pro se* prisoner civil rights action filed by Leroy Peoples ("Plaintiff") against the above-captioned parole officer ("Defendant"), are (1) Defendant's motion to revoke Plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") status under the so-called "three strikes rule" and conditionally dismiss the Complaint for failure to pay the required filing fee, and (2) United States Magistrate Judge Thérèse Wiley Dancks' Report-Recommendation recommending that Defendant's motion be denied. (Dkt. Nos. 19, 27.) The parties have not

filed an objection to the Report-Recommendation, and the time in which to do so has expired.

(See generally, Docket Sheet.)

After carefully reviewing the relevant papers herein, including Magistrate Judge Dancks' thorough Report-Recommendation, the Court can find no clear error in the Report-Recommendation: Magistrate Judge Dancks employed the proper standards, accurately recited the facts, and reasonably applied the law to those facts. As a result, the Report-Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety for the reasons stated therein, and Defendant's motion to revoke Plaintiff's IFP status and conditionally dismiss the Complaint for failure to pay the filing fee is denied.

ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Dancks' Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 27) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in its entirety; and it is further

ORDERED that Defendant's motion to revoke Plaintiff's IFP status and conditionally dismiss the Complaint for failure to pay the filing fee (Dkt. No. 19) is **DENIED**.

Dated: June 13, 2023

Syracuse, New York

Glenn T. Suddaby U.S. District Judge

When no objection is made to a report-recommendation, the Court subjects that report-recommendation to only a clear error review. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory Committee Notes: 1983 Addition. When performing such a "clear error" review, "the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Id.*; *see also Batista v. Walker*, 94-CV-2826, 1995 WL 453299, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 1995) (Sotomayor, J.) ("I am permitted to adopt those sections of [a magistrate judge's] report to which no specific objection is made, so long as those sections are not facially erroneous.") (internal quotation marks omitted).